

Date: Sat, 5 Mar 94 11:11:06 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #245  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Sat, 5 Mar 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 245

Today's Topics:

ARLB022 New South Carolina SM  
ARLB024 ARRL, FCC ink pact  
ARRL Bulletin 23 ARLB023  
first letter  
Further criminalization of scanning  
IMPORTANT - June VHF QSO Party  
JARGON  
QRP expedition  
second letter

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Fri, 4 Mar 1994 14:46:06 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
marchbg@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARLB022 New South Carolina SM  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SB QST @ ARL \$ARLB022  
ARLB022 New South Carolina SM

ZCZC AG86  
QST de W1AW  
ARRL Bulletin 22 ARLB022  
>From ARRL Headquarters  
Newington CT March 2, 1994

To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB022  
ARLB022 New South Carolina SM

New South Carolina SM

Michael Epstein, KD1DS, has been named Section Manager of the ARRL South Carolina Section. He will complete the term of office of Arnold Jordan, WB4BZA, which runs until December 31, 1994.

NNNN

/EX

--

=====  
Marc B. Grant      Voice Mail: 214-246-1150  
marcbg@netcom.com      Amateur Radio N5MEI  
marcbg@esy.com  
=====

-----

Date: Fri, 4 Mar 1994 14:48:52 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
marcbg@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARLB024 ARRL, FCC ink pact  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SB QST @ ARL \$ARLB024  
ARLB024 ARRL, FCC ink pact

ZCZC AG88  
QST de W1AW  
ARRL Bulletin 24 ARLB024  
>From ARRL Headquarters  
Newington CT March 3, 1994  
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB024  
ARLB024 ARRL, FCC ink pact

ARRL, FCC ink pact

The ARRL and the Field Operations Bureau (FOB) of the Federal Communications Commission have signed a new agreement concerning the use of amateur volunteers.

The agreement is a revised and expanded version of one entered into in 1984, and spells out the roles of amateurs, as trained and

registered Official Observers, as well as the role of the FOB. The volunteers continue to be known as the ARRL Amateur Auxiliary to the Field Operations Bureau ('AA').

While the new agreement continues to place initial information gathering at the local level, ie, in conjunction with regional FOB offices, it specifies a more centralized system for presenting information to the FOB in cases where enforcement is requested. This will be done between the office of the Chief, FOB, and the League's Washington office.

The new agreement also adds an FOB agreement to protect the identities of Amateur Auxiliary members, to the extent allowed by law, when the FCC institutes an enforcement proceeding involving information provided by the AA.

The FOB also agrees to assist the ARRL in the training of volunteers and in publicizing the objectives and accomplishments of the program.

The new agreement became effective February 26, 1994.

NNNN

/EX

--

=====  
Marc B. Grant      Voice Mail: 214-246-1150  
marcbg@netcom.com      Amateur Radio N5MEI  
marcbg@esy.com  
=====

-----

Date: Fri, 4 Mar 1994 14:47:34 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
marcbg@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL Bulletin 23    ARLB023  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SB QST @ ARL \$ARLB023  
ARLB023 Call sign plan extended

ZCZC AG87  
QST de W1AW  
ARRL Bulletin 23    ARLB023  
>From ARRL Headquarters  
Newington CT    March 3, 1994  
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB023  
ARLB023 Call sign plan extended

Call sign plan extended

The FCC has granted an ARRL request to extend the comment deadline in its 'vanity' call sign proposal, in PR Docket 93-305.

The comment deadline was extended to April 21, 1994; the reply comment deadline was extended to May 23, 1994.

The Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making was released December 29, 1993, with an original comment deadline of March 7, 1994. The League said more time was needed for response because of the importance of the proposal to amateurs and therefore the need to ensure fairness in whatever system was adopted.

In granting the League's request the FCC said 'it is desirable that the record be as complete as possible and that it reflect the views of the amateur community.'

An ARRL ad-hoc committee on this proposal includes Directors Steve Mendelsohn, WA2DHF; Frank Butler, W4RH; Tom Comstock, N5TC; John Kanode, N4MM; and Brad Wyatt, K6WR. Members should address their comments to 'Docket 93-305 Committee,' and send them to ARRL HQ.

More information on the proposal is in February 1994 QST on pages 9 and 84-86.

NNNN

/EX

--

=====

Marc B. Grant      Voice Mail: 214-246-1150  
marcbg@netcom.com      Amateur Radio N5MEI  
marcbg@esy.com

=====

-----

Date: 4 Mar 94 03:07:31 GMT  
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!msuinfo!netnews.upenn.edu!mipg.upenn.edu!  
yee@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: first letter  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

This is a (hopefully accurate) transcription of the first letter that was sent to me. Any typographical errors not noted below are my own. These are not my words and are the words of the ARRL. The use of the

symbol "\$" is in lieu of a non printable symbol in the letter.

Conway Yee, N2JWQ/AA

===== begin letter =====

January 28, 1994

Mr. Conway Yee N2JWQ  
2144 East 21 Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11229

Dear Mr. Yee:

This office represents the American Radio Relay League, Incorporated. I have been referred an Internet message posted by you concerning the publication of a repeater database on line. While the League does not wish to be uncooperative, and is in fact supportive of volunteer efforts to provide information to radio amateurs, it is unfortunately obligated to enforce its copyrights, or lose the ability to do so. Your use of the Repeater Directory, and its format, as the basis for your on-line database is an infringement of the League's copyright. We are compelled to request that you cease any use of it in putting together any repeater database.

I understand from your Internet message that you have been informed that use of the data from the Repeater Directory is not a copyright infringement. I disagree with whatever source you have consulted, however. The Repeater Directory is a compilation, as defined at 17 U.S.C. §101, and is protected as such by 17 U.S.C. §103. Furthermore, your database uses the format of the League's Repeater Directory, and by your own admission uses the same coding sequence for the characteristics for each repeater. This is a separate basis for concerns about copyright infringement.

The enforcement of copyrights is not something in which the League wishes to involve itself, and we certainly do not intend to deprive anyone of information about repeaters. We are placed, however, in a difficult position, to the extent that the League's copyright cannot [sic] be enforced selectively. We are therefore obligated to request that you immediately stop all use of the Repeater Directory as you have commenced to do. We apologise [sic] for having to take this position, but must pursue any further publication of your database in any form which uses either the compiled data contained in the Repeater Directory, or its format.

We hope that this does not cause you significant difficulty, and that you understand our position in the matter.

Yours very truly,

Christopher D. Imlay, N3AKD  
General Counsel, ARRL

--

Medical Image Processing Group		Conway Yee, N2JWQ
411 Blockley Hall		EMAIL : yee@mipg.upenn.edu
418 Service Drive		VOICE : 1 (215) 662-6780
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021 (USA)		FAX : 1 (215) 898-9145

-----

Date: 4 Mar 94 00:21:23 GMT  
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!  
news.delphi.com!gilbaronw0mn@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Further criminalization of scanning  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>around for a long, long time as used equipment. The effects of the law  
>will be to a) \*not\* severely restrict the availability of cordless-capable  
>scanners and b) give the public a false sense of security.  
>Rather than thickening the law books, the government should educate the  
>public about what is going on. The public will demand encrypted  
>cordless phones and the manufacturers will deliver. Then the law is  
>going to do is damage the lives of the very few people who get confidential  
information  
>on their cordless phones.  
>  
>I'd be interested if other people agree.  
>  
>  
>--Neil  
>

I could not agree more.

Gil Baron, El Baronvir"  
PGP2.3 key at key servers or upon request

-----

Date: 5 Mar 94 16:58:57 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: IMPORTANT - June VHF QSO Party  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Roger Keating KD6EFQ (keating@nosc.mil) said...

>Scott, I share your dissatisfaction that the date changed, but I'm not  
>sure that it should be moved back to the other date for 1994. Some of  
>us have already made our plans for this year's contest for the date  
>stated now.

I realize this, but in talking to many hams both locally and via email,  
I have found that all but one or two are not even aware that the contest  
is currently scheduled for the first and not the second weekend! I bet many  
people have already made plans for the second weekend.

>It would have been better if the National Convention hadn't been  
>scheduled when it was, but if one had to move, the contest probably was  
>the easier don't you think? I intend to participate in both the  
>convention and the contest.

I VEHEMENTLY DISAGREE!! Moving either event from dates known or expected  
over two years ago doesn't come close to being "easy". The ARRL June VHF QSO  
Party is traditionally held on the second weekend in June, just as Field Day,  
November Sweepstakes, the CQ WW and ARRL DX contests have their traditional  
weekends. Many groups travel to specific sites year after year for events  
like these and reserve both the site and their schedules way in advance.  
Conventions that are the size of an ARRL National Convention are also  
planned and booked a couple of years in advance. Clearly, the convention date  
is a "hard" date, but the second weekend in June is as much a "hard" date  
for the June VHF QSO Party because of precedent. The best course of action  
for the ARRL should have been to leave both events on the second weekend of  
June. I know you and some others would like to participate in both the contest  
and the national convention, but I have got to believe that there are far more  
people who have an interest in one but not the other of these events.

I suspect that the ARRL signed a contract with the convention site in Texas  
and they'd be in big financial trouble if they cancelled or moved its date.  
I contend that the ARRL has implicitly formed a contract with the participants  
in major operating events by always scheduling these events for the same time  
every year. If the ARRL defaulted on the convention contract a mere six months  
before the event, they'd pay big. This is exactly what happened to us VHF  
contesters: six months before the event, the ARRL announced via its annual  
calendar of events that it was "defaulting" on the date of the June VHF QSO  
Party, except it's the participants that will suffer in this case. The 1994  
ARRL National Convention date was approved 2 1/2 years prior to the event. I  
bet if they'd cancelled/moved the date a little after that, say 2 years from  
event, the cost of the change would have been minimal. Even if they didn't do

that, the ARRL had the opportunity 2 1/2 years ago to schedule, announce, and remind the VHF/UHF community of whatever non-traditional date they chose for the 1994 June VHF QSO Party. The impact of the date change would have been much easier to take with that much notice, just as the impact to the convention site in Texas would have been easier for them to take with two years notice.

Once again, I urge people to contact their division directors and Dave Sumner at ARRL headquarters and make their opinions known and ask that the 1994 June VHF QSO Party be placed back to the second weekend in June.

73,

Scott W01G

=====

Scott Sminkey email: sasminkey@eng.xyplex.com  
Software Sustaining Engineering voice: 508 952-4792  
Xyplex, Inc. fax: 508 952-4887  
295 Foster St. (Opinions, comments, etc. are mine,  
Littleton, MA 01460 not Xyplex's...)

-----  
Date: 4 Mar 1994 14:36:27 GMT  
From: solaris.cc.vt.edu!usenet@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: JARGON  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2l3nuj\$pr@bigfoot.wustl.edu> jlw3@cec3.wustl.edu (Jesse L Wei) writes:

{stuff deleted}

> Now this is my question: do hams \*ever\* talk about anything besides what  
> kind of rig (s)he's got, ham problems, ham equipment, etc? As a waiting  
> (as in for my ticket) prospective, I've listened to the local repeaters,  
> and personally, the conversations seem pretty boring if that's all you  
> ever talk about. Have I missed anything? or something? Is the purpose  
> of ham radio to talk about the technicalities of it? I know that the  
> whole nature of it requires technicality, but isn't there more to  
> it than that?  
>  
> --jesse (still waiting)

In my area, most hams talk about their location. For example,

Ham1: "I'm sitting in the parking lot at work. Where are you?"  
Ham2: "I'm in the drive-through at Wendy's."



So sometimes technical discussions are less boring than other topics :-).

Seriously, making small talk is an art. Some people do it well, while others never really get the hang of it. But there are many bright spots. There's a lot of diversity among hams. If you can get past the small talk, there are a lot of interesting stories to be told. That's one reason I like HF: It adds to the number of potential QSOs.

And some hams are happy to hide behind the small talk. That's their right. They may enjoy just using the radio. The actual exchange is secondary. Or they may really like the technical discussions. I fit both of these categories to some degree. But there are others that enjoy discussing "less boring" topics. Sometimes you just have to wait for the right QSO to come along.

Hope your license comes soon and good luck with the hobby. I'm sure you'll find some really great QSOs among all those boring ones.

--

Benjy Cline, AC4X0  
Virginia Tech Computing Center  
benjy@benjy.cc.vt.edu

-----

Date: 4 Mar 1994 09:01:11 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: QRP expedition  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The Amateur Radio Club at Tennessee Technological University (TTARS) is going to be doing a QRP expedition (special events) on April 16, 17, 18.

The purpose of this expedition is to promote amateur radio, and in particular show how lower power is an effective mode of communications both for SSB and CW. I hope that this will really inspire the college students here (almost all are Technicians) to upgrade to General Class and to get them more interested in Ham radio in general.

We will be going to a state park that has some pretty good wilderness type areas with some great cliffs. If the weather permits we will be operating at some pretty spectacular locations. We plan on operating both SSB and CW with a possibility of 2 separate stations. We will either have certificates or QSL cards with a picture of one of the locations. I hope to write the experience up for a magazine article.

I would like some input in setting up the schedule of operating bands/modes/frequencies. The only advertisement for this event will be via Internet and Packet (part of the concept). I think that we will probably operate between 15:00Z and 04:00Z daily. We will be setting up on the 15th and if things go well start operating in a test mode at that point. So what do suggest for example for CW from xx-xx on Y meters at ZZZZZ.ZZ freq-ZZZZZ.ZZ freq.

Due to the fact that most of the operators (99.9%) are not CW people (yet) much of the planned operating will be on SSB.. which I believe is good.. too many people have the concept that QRP is CW only and that turns some people off to start with..to get more people trying this... hopefully will be able to show them it works well on SSB also.

thanks

Jeff, AC4HF

-----  
Date: 4 Mar 94 03:08:08 GMT  
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!msuinfo!netnews.upenn.edu!mipg.upenn.edu!yee@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: second letter  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

This is a copy of the letter that is the reply to my queries to the ARRL. This was taken directly from an email sent to me via email. Any typographical errors are the ARRL's.

Conway Yee, N2JWQ/AA

-----  
Mr. Conway Yee N2JWQ  
2144 East 21st Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11229

Dear Mr. Yee:

I am indeed surprised that my letter to you of January 28 has caused such concern among your Internet group. I hope that my last letter to you was not misinterpreted. Perhaps you would be kind enough to upload my letter to you and this one, without editorial comment, so that there will not be any confusion in the future on the part of Internet participants.

There are several reasons why the League, a publisher of

materials for radio amateurs, and a membership organization, is required to maintain the copyright protection for its intellectual property. First, and perhaps most importantly, the law is that unless a copyright holder protects its property upon being alerted to an infringement, it cannot do so in the future. Therefore, if the League is ever going to protect its copyright in the compilation that is the repeater directory, it must do so uniformly, and on a timely basis.

Second, the repeater directory is one of the League's publications that it sells to fund its membership services. The publication is produced, in part, because the document is a service to radio amateurs. Also, in part, it is sold as a means of offsetting the costs of the League's programs, so that it may keep its dues at a reasonable level for members and continue to provide association services. The League provides certain services only to members, and others to everyone. The costs associated with this are substantial. It is not inexpensive to protect amateur frequency allocations, for example. The revenue for these programs comes, in large part, from the sale of publications. No reasonable person could expect that the materials that make up the compilation, which cost a significant amount to compile and produce in any case, would simply be given away. If we lost copyright protection for the Repeater Directory, others could simply produce a similar product and sell it. While this is not your intention, of course, it may be that of others.

Third, we haven't the authority to permit you to copy the Repeater Directory even if it was otherwise reasonable to do so. Some of the material in the directory is itself copyrighted material, compilations of data, from regional repeater coordinating entities. We use that data by agreement with the copyright holders. Those agreements are not broad enough to permit us to authorize other uses of those compilations. Your unauthorized use of the Repeater Directory would constitute a violation of their copyright not only by you, but by the League as well.

You ask whether it is the League's position that it owns the "facts" present in the League's copyrighted publication. The directory is a compilation, and as such the document as a whole is protected. The League does not own the data, but it does own the compilation. Without attempting to teach a course in copyright law, the concept is that a copyright holder owns not an idea, but the creator's particular expression of that idea. You are certainly enough entitled to create your own repeater database, but you cannot copy the League's Repeater Directory as a means of doing so, and you cannot use the format of the

League's Repeater Directory, including but not limited to the coding of the characteristics of the repeaters, and the geographic presentation of the data. The copyright holder has, among other rights, the exclusive ability to copy or reproduce the work, and to distribute copies of the work, as well as the right to prepare modified or different versions of the work, called derivative works.

If you want to prepare a repeater listing, you will have to do what the League, or any other preparer of a copyrighted work containing data, does: compile your own listing of repeaters by contacting repeater trustees, coordinators, and the like, and make your own listing. Any use of copyrighted works, such as the MACC repeater listing, or the Repeater Directory, in making your own compilation, is a copyright infringement. For the above reasons, we have to enforce the copyright.

I hope that this clarifies my last letter, and that there will not be any further misunderstanding proliferated on the Internet. You are of course entitled to your opinion of the copyright laws in the United States, and of the League's interest in protecting its ability to continue to publish the Repeater Directory. Basic fairness, however, demands that any factual representations made on the Internet on this subject be accurate.

Yours very truly,

Christopher D. Imlay, N3AKD  
General Counsel, ARRL

cc: David Sumner  
Barry Shelley  
Jay Mabey

--

Medical Image Processing Group		Conway Yee, N2JWQ
411 Blockley Hall		EMAIL : yee@mipg.upenn.edu
418 Service Drive		VOICE : 1 (215) 662-6780
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021 (USA)		FAX : 1 (215) 898-9145

-----

Date: 3 Mar 94 18:12:37 GMT

From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!cc.usu.edu!  
sy\_j.pgh.wec.com!user@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <199402282109.NAA17392@ucsd.edu>,  
<ah301-010394145634@sy\_j.pgh.wec.com>, <edh.762652082@hpuerca>gh.wec.c  
Subject : Re: JARGON

In article <edh.762652082@hpuerca>, edh@hpuerca.atl.hp.com (Ed Humphries)  
wrote:

> In <1994Mar2.144907.26098@bongo.tele.com> julian@bongo.tele.com (Julian  
Macassey) writes:

>

> >A skilled ham

> >communicator can spin a simple event out so that the description of it

> >takes three times longer than the duration of the actual event.

>

> I don't know about 3x, but every since my wife became a ham, she

> has taken to giving me a 45 minute summary of 30 minute TV shows

> that I didn't want to watch, much less hear about :-)

>

speaking of hamspeak and contentless communication ;^)

from my observation, usually the retired people are the experts at  
that. Yesterday on my way home from work and the usual nut net  
with about 8 people talking, and all of a sudden the two retired  
people took over and was talking hamspeak (like repeating the same thing  
over and over again each time they spoke), and then they were about  
to clear because they said they do not want to hog the repeater  
(yeah right), but I think they talked about ten more times after they  
said clear before they actually let the repeater go. of course,  
everybody in the net was trying to be polite and nothing was said  
about it.

-----

Date: 3 Mar 94 23:17:08 GMT

From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!convex!constellation!  
osuunx.ucc.okstate.edu!olesun!gcouger@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9402271401591.gilbaronw0mn.DLITE@delphi.com>,  
<213360\$4jr@news.acns.nwu.edu>, <1994Mar3.145941.105846@yuma>  
Subject : Re: Electric Fence RFI/ Liabilities

In article <1994Mar3.145941.105846@yuma>,

Galen Watts <galen@picea.CFNR.ColoState.EDU> wrote:

>>In article <9402271401591.gilbaronw@omn.DLITE@delphi.com>,

>>Gilbert Baron <gilbaronw@omn@delphi.com> wrote:

>>>>I've got some bad interference on 80 through 10

>>>>meter bands from an electric fence about 500

>>>>feet away. The effect is very sharp clicks

>>>>Anyone have any cures?

>>>>Ned Hamilton, AB6FI

>

>If you can wait a few weeks until the grass starts to grow, the livestock

>will get a few zaps, learn about the fence, and I'll bet the owner shuts

>it off.

The farmer will not turn off the fence as long as there are livestock

inside. They can tell when its off some how. At least all the cows I

messed with in the last 30 years.

My suggestion is to get a cheap am fm radio and walk the fence and find what is causing the problem. It may very well be in the charger. Try to make friends with the farmer. That is not usually very hard to do. Just give him a ring when you see his stock out or stop by and give him a hand and visit. Find out if he has several chargers and check them all and ask him or help him put it on the fence.

Most chargers have some noise.

Good luck

Gordon AB5DG

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #245

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*